



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/738,458		/16/2003	Ulrich Rohs	ROHS-12/11	9583	
20151	7590	11/03/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HENRY M	<b>FEIEREIS</b>	SEN, LLC	BINDA, GREGORY JOHN			
350 FIFTH A SUITE 4714				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK, NY 10118				3679		

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief						

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/738,458	ROHS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Greg Binda	3679	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

•	
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 October 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of	
this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which	(2)
places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following	(a) ina
time periods:	119
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.	. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN	
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee	۵
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension for	iee
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2)	!) as
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely fil	led,
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date	of
filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Sin	ice
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).	_
AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for	r
appeal; and/or	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling	the
non-allowable claim(s).	f
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	,
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19,23 and 24</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary a	and
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	21 IG
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be	
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide	а
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:	:
See Continuation Sheet.	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
13. ⊠ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	
Greg Binda	
Primary Evaminor	

Greg Binda Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3679

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

**Application No. 10/738,458** 

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Proposed changes to claim 23 broaden the claim and thus constitute new issues for consideration. Applicant argues that these changes do not broaden the claim because they merely eliminate a redundant phrase. However, the proposed changes do alter the scope of the claim because proposed claim 23 is just original claim 20 rewritten so that it overcomes the rejection made in item 11 of the Non-Final Office action mailed March 15, 2005. As such if proposed claim 23 were entered then it would, at a minimum, be subject to rejection in the same manner claim 20 was rejected in item 13a of the Non-Final Office action.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that rejection at item 7a of the Final rejection is invalid because the offending limitation is supported at paragraphs 0010-0014. However, those paragraphs do not describe the restoring force as increasing with increased relative rotation between the first and second assemblies. Applicant argues that the rejection at item 7b of the Final rejection is invalid because the offending limitation is supported at paragraph 0042. However, as is clearly shown in the marked-up copy of the substitute specification, paragraph 0042 was added by amendment and therefore cannot be relied upon for overcoming this rejection.

Continuation of 13. Other: The substitute specification filed October 24, 2005 has been entered.